

Remarks

Claims 2-5, 8, 11, and 18-28 have been cancelled and claims 1, 7, and 10 have been amended leaving claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 12-17 pending in the application.

Applicant expressly affirms election of Group 1 drawn to claims 1-17 and has cancelled claims 18-28 herein.

Claims 7, 8, 16, and 17 have been indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent from including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended claim 7 to include both the subject matter of claim 8 as well all necessary limitations of base claim 1 and any intervening claims. As amended claim 7 is believed to be allowable. Applicant reserves the right to amend claims 16 and 17 upon the Examiner's consideration of the amendments and remarks herein.

Previously pending claim 1 has been rejected as anticipated by US 4,833,274 ('274 reference) and/or Vasil'eva et. al. Applicant requests reconsideration of this rejection in light of the amendments to the claims and remarks.

The pending claims are anticipated "only if each and every element as set forth in the claims are found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868

F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Each and every element set forth in the claims are not described in either of the cited references.

For example, claim 1 has been amended to recite the specific R_F groups -CF(CF₃)₂ or -C₆F₁₃. Neither of the cited references describes these groups in combination with remaining limitations of claim 1. As such claim 1 is novel in view of these references.

Claims 6 and 9 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons given above regarding claim 1.

Claim 10 has been rejected based on the same grounds as claim 1. Claim 10 has also been amended to recite the specific R_F groups that are not described by the cited references. For at least this reason, claim 10 and claims 12-14 depending therefrom are novel in view of the cited references.

Claim 15 stands rejected in view Vasil'eva et. al alone. Claim 15 recites a composition comprising R_{Cl}(R_T)_nH. It is understandable that Vasil'eva does not describe this compound because Vasil'eva describes reaction products of CCl₄, not CHCl₃ as provided by the Applicants specification. For at least the reason Vasil'eva does not describe all the elements of claim 15, claim 15 as well as claims 16 and 17 depending therefrom are allowable.

Applicants request allowance of the pending claims in the Examiner's next action. If the Examiner has an objection to any of these claims, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (509) 624-4276 between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. (PST)

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12/26/07

By: 
Robert C. Hyta
Reg. No. 46,791

--END OF DOCUMENT--